

Appl. No. 10/781,355
Amdt. Dated November 7, 2007
Reply to Office Action of August 9, 2007

Attorney Docket No. 81872.0056
Customer No.: 26021

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS:

Claims 6 and 11 are amended. Support for the amendments to claims 6 and 11 can be found at p. 20, lines 18-22 of Applicant's specification. New claims 19-21 are added. Support for new claims 19 and 20 can be found in original claim 6 and at p. 20, lines 11-21 of Applicant's specification. Support for new claim 21 can be found at p. 20, line 23-p. 21, line 2 of Applicant's specification. Claims 1-21 are pending in the application. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, are respectfully requested.

The present invention relates to photoelectric conversion devices used for solar power generation and the like, and in particular, to a photoelectric conversion device using crystalline semiconductor particles and a method of manufacturing the device. (Applicant's specification, at p. 1, lines 9-13).

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102:

Claims 1-3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Bartlett (U.S. Patent No. 4,514,580). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Claim 1 is as follows:

A photoelectric conversion device comprising:
a substrate serving as a lower electrode;
first conductivity-type crystalline semiconductor particles deposited on the substrate;
second conductivity-type semiconductor layers formed on the crystalline semiconductor particles;
an insulator layer formed among the crystalline semiconductor particles; and

an upper electrode layer formed on the second conductivity-type semiconductor layers,

wherein the second conductivity-type semiconductor layers each have a smaller thickness at or below an equator of each of the crystalline semiconductor particles than at a zenith thereof.

Applicant respectfully submits that Bartlett cannot anticipate or render claim 1 obvious, because Bartlett fails to teach or suggest "the second conductivity-type semiconductor layers each have a smaller thickness at or below an equator of each of the crystalline semiconductor particles than at a zenith thereof."

It is an aspect of the present invention that "an indentation S be provided toward the interior of the particle on a surface below the equator of the crystalline semiconductor particle 3. Providing the indentation S toward the interior of the particle on a surface lower than the equator of the crystalline semiconductor particle 3 can prevent the semiconductor layer 4 from being formed in regions lower than the indentation S. That is, the semiconductor layer 4 formed on the surface of the crystalline semiconductor particle 3 has the largest thickness at the zenith, and gradually becomes thinner as it extends downward from the zenith until the thickness is almost zero at a position below the indentation S. Providing the indentation S allows the semiconductor layer 4 to disappear at an intermediate point between the zenith of the semiconductor particle 3 and the substrate 1. Accordingly, electrical separation between the upper electrode layer 5 and the substrate 1 can be reliably accomplished. This is favorable because owing to the electrical separation, leak current flowing through the second conductivity-type semiconductor layer 4 to the lower electrode can be reduced." (Applicant's specification, at p. 12, lines 4-25).

Appl. No. 10/781,355
Amdt. Dated November 7, 2007.
Reply to Office Action of August 9, 2007

Attorney Docket No. 81872.0056
Customer No.: 26021

In contrast, in Bartlett, as illustrated in Appendix A, submitted concurrently herewith, the thickness of the second conductivity-type semiconductor layer above the equator is the same as the thickness of the semiconductor layer below the equator.

In light of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that Bartlett cannot anticipate or render claim 1 obvious, because Bartlett fails to teach or suggest each and every claim limitation. Claims 2 and 3 depend from claim 1 and therefore, cannot be anticipated or rendered obvious for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Withdrawal of this rejection is thus respectfully requested.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103:

Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bartlett in view of Stanbery (U.S. Patent No. 4,322,571). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 4 depends from claim 1 and as such includes all the limitations of claim 1, and therefore, cannot be rendered obvious over Bartlett for the same reasons discussed above. Stanbery cannot remedy the defect of Bartlett and is not relied upon by the Office for such. Instead, the Office cites Stanbery for teaching a photoelectric conversion device and a textured surface/indentations/V-shaped ridges so as to optimize the light collection and current generation efficiencies.

In light of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references either alone or in combination cannot render claim 4 obvious, because the combination of references fails to teach or suggest each and every claim limitation. Withdrawal of this rejection is thus respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 10/781,355
Amdt. Dated November 7, 2007
Reply to Office Action of August 9, 2007

Attorney Docket No. 81872.0056
Customer No.: 26021

Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bartlett in view of Nakata (WO99/10935). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 5 depends from claim 1 and as such includes all the limitations of claim 1, and therefore, cannot be rendered obvious over Bartlett for the same reasons discussed above. Nakata (WO99/10935) cannot remedy the defect of Bartlett and is not relied upon by the Office for such. Instead, the Office cites Nakata (WO99/10935) for teaching a photoelectric spherical semiconductor device and irregularities/rough edges of the core substrate with an elevation difference of 1 micrometer similar to the situation with spherical solar cell that has been sandblasted and a large proportion of the sphere surface is a p-n junction that generates a photovoltage, wherein a large portion of the light reaches the sphere surface, wherein the light is scattered, absorbed, and converted to electricity.

In light of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references either alone or in combination cannot render claim 5 obvious, because the combination of references fails to teach or suggest each and every claim limitation. Withdrawal of this rejection is thus respectfully requested.

Claims 4 and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bartlett in view of Sugawara et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0162585). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claims 4 and 5 depend from claim 1 and as such include all the limitations of claim 1, and therefore, cannot be rendered obvious over Bartlett for the same reasons discussed above. Sugawara (USPPN. 2002/0162585) cannot remedy the defect of Bartlett and is not relied upon by the Office for such. Instead, the Office cites Sugawara (USPPN. 2002/0162585) for teaching a photoelectric conversion device with semiconductor spherical particles and pyramidal projections as having

Appl. No. 10/781,355
Amdt. Dated November 7, 2007
Reply to Office Action of August 9, 2007

Attorney Docket No. 81872.0056
Customer No.: 26021

an indentation toward the interior thereof at a surface below the equator/outline and when the pyramidal projection is formed by light that has entered the projection is refracted and directed to the crystalline semiconductor particles so as to contribute to power generation.

In light of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references either alone or in combination cannot render claims 4 and 5 obvious, because the combination of references fails to teach or suggest each and every claim limitation. Withdrawal of this rejection is thus respectfully requested.

Claims 6-8, 10, and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bartlett in view of Stanbery. The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Claim 6, as amended, is as follows:

A photoelectric conversion device comprising:
a substrate serving as a lower electrode;
first conductivity-type crystalline semiconductor particles on the substrate;
second conductivity-type semiconductor layers formed on the crystalline semiconductor particles;
an insulator layer formed among the crystalline semiconductor particles; and
an upper electrode layer formed on the second conductivity-type semiconductor layers,
wherein the second conductivity-type semiconductor layers include an impurity element with a concentration decreasing with proximity to the crystalline semiconductor particles, wherein the impurity element comprises one element selected from the group consisting of oxygen, nitrogen, carbon, and hydrogen.

Appl. No. 10/781,355
Amdt. Dated November 7, 2007
Reply to Office Action of August 9, 2007

Attorney Docket No. 81872.0056
Customer No.: 26021

Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references cannot render claim 6 obvious, because the cited references fail to teach or suggest that "the second conductivity-type semiconductor layers include an impurity element with a concentration decreasing with proximity to the crystalline semiconductor particles, wherein the impurity element comprises one element selected from the group consisting of oxygen, nitrogen, carbon, and hydrogen."

It is an aspect of the present invention that "when a concentration gradient of oxygen, nitrogen, carbon or hydrogen is provided, significant effects are obtained in terms of improvement of adhesion to the insulator layer 2 and improvement of adhesion to the upper electrode layer 5." (Applicant's specification, at p. 20, lines 18-22).

Bartlett fails to disclose wherein the second conductivity-type semiconductor layers include any type of impurity element with a concentration decreasing with proximity to the crystalline semiconductor particles, much less that the impurity element comprises one element selected from the group consisting of oxygen, nitrogen, carbon, and hydrogen; and Bartlett is not relied upon by the Office for such.

Instead, the Office cites Stanbery for teaching the dispersion of n-dopant impurity atoms such as phosphorous, boron, arsenic, antimony, etc. (Stanbery, column 2, lines 54-68). However, Stanbery has no teaching or suggestion of using oxygen, nitrogen, carbon, or hydrogen.

In light of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references cannot render claim 6 obvious, because the combination of references fails to teach or suggest each and every claim limitation. Claims 7, 8, and 10 depend from claim 6 and therefore, cannot be rendered obvious over the cited references for at least the same reasons discussed above. Claim 11 requires the

Appl. No. 10/781,355
Amtd. Dated November 7, 2007
Reply to Office Action of August 9, 2007

Attorney Docket No. 81872.0056
Customer No.: 26021

similar limitation that at least one element selected from the group consisting of oxygen, nitrogen, carbon and hydrogen is included in the semiconductor layers. Withdrawal of this rejection is thus respectfully requested.

Claims 12 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bartlett and Stanberry as applied to claim 11 above, and in further view of Nakata (U.S. Patent No. 6,294,822). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claims 12 and 13 depend from claim 11 and as such include all the limitations of claim 11, and therefore, cannot be rendered obvious over Bartlett and Stanberry for the same reasons discussed above. Nakata (USPN 6,294,822) cannot remedy the defect of Bartlett and Stanberry and is not relied upon by the Office for such. Instead, the Office cites Nakata (USPN 6,294,822) for teaching a photoelectric spherical semiconductor device and electrodes which contact aluminum layer and the n-type/second conductive semiconductive layer with circular openings which reach the surface of the aluminum layer such that the n-type/second conductive layer are formed at two positions which are symmetric with respect to the center of the core to have the electrodes contact the aluminum layer.

In light of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references either alone or in combination cannot render claims 12 and 13 obvious, because the combination of references fails to teach or suggest each and every claim limitation. Withdrawal of this rejection is thus respectfully requested.

Claims 9 and 14-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bartlett and Stanberry as applied to claim 6 above, and in further view of Nakata (USPN 6,294,822). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Appl. No. 10/781,355
Amdt. Dated November 7, 2007
Reply to Office Action of August 9, 2007

Attorney Docket No. 81872.0056
Customer No.: 26021

Claims 9 and 14-18 depend from claim 6 and as such include all the limitations of claim 6, and therefore, cannot be rendered obvious over Bartlett and Stanbery for the same reasons discussed above. Nakata (USPN 6,294,822) cannot remedy the defect of Bartlett and Stanbery and is not relied upon by the Office for such. Instead, the Office cites Nakata (USPN 6,294,822) for teaching a photoelectric spherical semiconductor device and an oxide layer such as silicon dioxide, passivation film formed over the entire surface of the spherical body and the passivation film reduces the recombination velocity of a minority of carriers and the proportion of photo-generated carriers, which contribute to the photoelectric conversion is increased.

In light of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references either alone or in combination cannot render claims 9 and 14-18 obvious, because the combination of references fails to teach or suggest each and every claim limitation. Withdrawal of this rejection is thus respectfully requested.

Claims 6-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bartlett in view of Sugawara et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0023674). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references cannot render claims 6-16 obvious, because the cited references fail to teach or suggest that the second conductivity-type semiconductor layers include at least “one element selected from the group consisting of oxygen, nitrogen, carbon, and hydrogen.”

As discussed above, Bartlett fails to teach or suggest one element selected from the group consisting of oxygen, nitrogen, carbon, and hydrogen. Sugawara (USPPN 2002/0023674) similarly fails to teach or suggest one element selected from the group consisting of oxygen, nitrogen, carbon, and hydrogen. Instead, Sugawara (USPPN 2002/0023674) teaches the second conductivity-type semiconductor layer

Appl. No. 10/781,355
Amdt. Dated November 7, 2007
Reply to Office Action of August 9, 2007

Attorney Docket No. 81872.0056
Customer No.: 26021

comprises two layers each of which has an impurity addition concentration that differs from the other such that the impurity addition concentration in the lower layer of the second conductivity-type semiconductor layer is lower than that in the upper layer of the second conductivity-type semiconductor layer (Sugawara (USPPN 2002/0023674), paragraph [0047]); and the first conductivity-type crystalline semiconductor particles comprise 3 Si, Ge, and a small amount of p-type impurity such as B, Al, and Ga, or n-type impurity such as P and As (Sugawara (USPPN 2002/0023674), paragraph [0072]).

In light of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references either alone or in combination cannot render claims 6-16 obvious, because the combination of references fails to teach or suggest each and every claim limitation. Withdrawal of this rejection is thus respectfully requested.

Claims 17 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bartlett and Sugawara (USPPN 2002/0023674) as applied to claim 14 above, and in further view of Sugawara et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0162585). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claims 17 and 18 depend from claim 14 and as such include all the limitations of claim 14, and therefore, cannot be rendered obvious over Bartlett and Sugawara (USPPN 2002/0023674) for the same reasons discussed above. Sugawara (USPPN 2002/0162585) cannot remedy the defect of Bartlett and Sugawara (USPPN 2002/0023674) and is not relied upon by the Office for such. Instead, the Office cites Sugawara (USPPN 2002/0162585) for teaching a photoelectric conversion device with semiconductor spherical particles and pyramidal projections as having an indentation toward the interior thereof at a surface below the equator/outline and when the pyramidal projection is formed the light that has

Appl. No. 10/781,355
Amdt. Dated November 7, 2007
Reply to Office Action of August 9, 2007

Attorney Docket No. 81872.0056
Customer No.: 26021

entered the projection is refracted and direction to the crystalline semiconductor particles so as to contribute to power generation.

In light of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references either alone or in combination cannot render claims 17 and 18 obvious, because the combination of references fails to teach or suggest each and every claim limitation. Withdrawal of this rejection is thus respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, are requested.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles, California telephone number (310) 785-4600 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

If there are any fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-1314.


Respectfully submitted,
HOGAN & HARTSON L.L.P.

By: 
Barry M. Shuman
Registration No. 50,220


Date: November 7, 2007

1999 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1400
Los Angeles, California 90067
Phone: 310.785.4600
Fax: 310.785.4601

APPENDIX A



From Figure 1 of present invention



From Figure 2 of Bartlett